

*Alf*

## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Charles R. Norgle	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	07 C 7084	DATE	7/23/2008
CASE TITLE	Israel vs. Circuit Court, et al.		

## DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

Plaintiff's Motion to Amend [57] is denied.

Docketing to mail notices.

[ For further details see text below.]

## STATEMENT

Plaintiff's proposed amended complaint is unorganized and indecipherable. Plaintiff must comply with the requirements of FRCP 8. Pursuant to that Rule, a complaint must contain: a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction, a short and plain claim showing that the plaintiff is entitled to relief, and a concise request for relief. "The [complaint] must be sufficiently specific to ensure that the district court can ascertain that the claim is not frivolous and that the arguable nature of the underlying claim is more than hope." Snyder v. Nolen, 380 F.3d 279, 297 (7th Cir. 2004). If Plaintiff does not conform the next proposed amended complaint to FRCP 8, the court will be within its discretion to dismiss the case. Lindell v. Houser, 442 F.3d 1033, 1035 n.1 (7th Cir. 2006) ("[Plaintiff's] complaint was probably dismissable for not being simple, concise and direct . . . District courts should not have to read and decipher tomes disguised as pleadings."); Davis v. Ruby Foods, Inc., 269 F.3d 818, 820 (7th Cir. 2001) ("The dismissal of a complaint on the ground that it is unintelligible is unexceptional . . . Such a complaint fails to give the defendant the notice to which he is entitled."). Plaintiff must also comply with the requirements of FRCP 10(b): claims must be stated in numbered paragraphs. With an abundance of caution, the court also reminds Plaintiff that he must be cognizant of FRCP 11.

Courtroom Deputy  
Initials: